



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,040	06/15/2001	Colin I' Anson	1509-188	5161

22429 7590 08/25/2005

LOWE HAUPTMAN GILMAN AND BERNER, LLP  
1700 DIAGONAL ROAD  
SUITE 300 /310  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

ELAHEE, MD S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2645

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/881,040

Applicant(s)

I' ANSON ET AL.

Examiner

Md S. Elahee

Art Unit

2645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,7-11 and 13-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,7-11 and 13-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/04/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. This action is responsive to an amendment filed on 06/06/05. Claims 1, 7-11 and 13-42 are pending. Claims 2-6, 12 and 43 have been cancelled.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 7-11 and 13-42 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection which is deemed appropriate to address all of the limitations at this time.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Regarding claim 28, the citations 'the service token including a qualifying-party indicator indicative of the party that qualified the user' on page 7, lines 9, 10 of the claim and 'the qualifying-party indicator to check that the service token originates from a party' on page 7, lines 15, 16 of the claim are not disclosed in the original specification.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 1, 8-11, 13, 14, 16-19 and 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Valentine et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,011,973) in view of Tarbox (U.S. Patent No. 5,705,798).

Regarding claim 1, Valentine teaches conducting a transaction of a user inherently purchasing a service or product which qualifies the user as authorized to benefit from a particular location-triggered service (col.1, lines 54-67, col.2, lines 1-14, line 45- col.3, line 20).

Valentine teaches location data indicative of at least one location where service delivery is to be triggered (col.1, lines 54-67, col.2, lines 1-14, line 45- col.3, line 20).

Valentine further teaches subsequently detecting a location match between the location of the user, as indicated by the location of a mobile entity associated with the user, and a location indicated by the location data (col.1, lines 54-67, col.2, lines 1-14, line 45- col.3, line 20).

However, it is not clear whether Valentine teaches “a user-associated instance of executable program, for implementing the particular service, the program instance being customized for said transaction and distinct from the location data” and “initiating execution of the user-associated program instance to deliver the particular service to the user”. Tarbox teaches a user-associated instance of executable program, for implementing the particular service, the program instance being customized for the transaction and distinct from the location data and initiating execution of the user-associated program instance to deliver the particular service to the user (fig.4; col.3, lines 19-23, col.5, lines 16-29). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Valentine to incorporate a user-associated instance of executable program, for implementing the particular service, the program instance being customized for said transaction and distinct from the location data as well as initiating execution of the user-associated program instance to deliver the particular service to the user as taught by Tarbox. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so

Art Unit: 2645

in order to conduct one or more electronic transaction of product without having any operating difficulties.

Regarding claim 8, Valentine does not specifically teach “the user-associated program-code instance is a customization of a generic program for implementing the service”. Tarbox teaches that the user-associated program-code instance is a customization of a generic program for implementing the service (col.3, lines 19-23, col.5, lines 16-29). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Valentine to incorporate the user-associated program-code instance being a customization of a generic program for implementing the service as taught by Tarbox. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide customized display features to a user.

Regarding claim 9, Valentine teaches that service delivery is conditional upon the user downloading a location information [i.e., inputting a personal identification code] (col.1, lines 54-67, col.2, lines 1-14, line 45- col.3, line 3).

Regarding claim 10, Valentine teaches that the message [i.e., service] delivery only continues whilst the user's current location matches with a location indicated by the location data (col.1, lines 54-67, col.2, lines 1-14, 45- 60).

Regarding claim 11, Valentine teaches that once initiated, service delivery is continued until completion (col.1, lines 54-67, col.2, lines 1-14, col.3, lines 21-40).

Regarding claim 13, Valentine teaches that the location data is indicative of multiple locations (col.3, lines 4-40).

Regarding claim 14, Valentine does not specifically teach “the user-associated program-code instance is a customization of a generic program for implementing the service”. Tarbox

teaches that multiple user-associated program instances associated with different services instances to be delivered to the same user, are stored in a memory [i.e., common repository] (fig.4; col.3, lines 19-23, col.5, lines 16-29). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Valentine to incorporate multiple user-associated program instances associated with different services instances to be delivered to the same user, are stored in a common repository as taught by Tarbox. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide a storage for different programming instructions.

Regarding claim 16, Valentine teaches that the current user location is provided to the entity carrying out location matching in step (b) by a trusted location service provider and is inherently digitally-signed by the latter (col.2, line 45- col.3, line 20).

Regarding claim 17, Valentine teaches that the updating program [i.e., user-associated program instance] specifies a particular number of times (including only once) that the updating program can be run (col.2, line 45- col.3, line 49). (Note; periodic location update with the period is set by the base station, it is inherent that updating program can be run only once)

Regarding claim 23, Valentine teaches that the updating program [i.e., user-associated program instance] is stored in the mobile entity, the detection of a location match in step (b) resulting in the location information [i.e., program instance] being executed at the mobile entity (col.2, line 45- col.3, line 49).

Regarding claim 24, Valentine teaches that the updating program [i.e., user-associated program instance] is stored in the mobile entity, the detection of a location match in step (b)

Art Unit: 2645

resulting in the location information [i.e., program-code instance] being passed from the mobile entity to a service provider system where it is executed (col.2, line 45- col.3, line 49).

Regarding claim 25, Valentine teaches that the updating program [i.e., user-associated program-code instance] is stored in the service provider system, the detection of a location match in step (b) resulting in the program-code instance being inherently executed by the service provider system (col.2, line 45- col.3, line 49).

Regarding claim 26, Valentine teaches that the updating program [i.e., user-associated program instance] and the location data are stored in the same entity (col.2, line 45- col.3, line 49).

Regarding claim 27, Valentine teaches that the updating program [i.e., user-associated program instance] and the location data are stored in the different entities, the location data having associated data enabling the entity storing the program instance to be informed when a location match is detected in step (b) (col.2, line 45- col.3, line 49).

Regarding claim 18 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Valentine teaches a memory 150 [i.e., location-data repository] (fig.1).

Valentine further teaches a database 190 [i.e., service repository] (fig.1; col.3, lines 9-13).

Valentine further teaches a base station 180 [i.e., service factory] (fig.1).

Valentine further teaches a cellular telephone network 170 [i.e., qualification subsystem] to benefit from a particular location-triggered service, the cellular telephone network being arranged, upon determining that the user is so qualified, both to store in the memory location data indicative of at least one location where service delivery is to be triggered, and also to create in the base station (fig.1; col.1, lines 54-67, col.2, lines 1-14, line 45- col.3, line 20).

Valentine further teaches a service execution environment for executing updating program [i.e., user-associated program instances] (col.1, lines 54-67, col.2, lines 1-14, line 45- col.3, line 3).

Valentine further teaches a location-match subsystem for detecting a location match between the location of the user, as indicated by the location of a mobile entity associated with the user, and a location indicated by the location data (col.1, lines 54-67, col.2, lines 1-14, line 45- col.3, line 20).

Valentine further teaches a control arrangement responsive to the location-match subsystem detecting a location match to initiate execution of the updating program [i.e., user-associated program instance] to deliver the particular service to the user (col.2, line 45- col.3, line 20).

Regarding claim 19, Valentine teaches that the memory [i.e., location repository] is incorporated in the mobile entity associated with the user (fig.1; col.2, lines 45- 60).

9. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Valentine et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,011,973) in view of Tarbox (U.S. Patent No. 5,705,798) further in view of Okamoto et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0128257).

Regarding claim 15, Valentine in view of Tarbox does not specifically teach that the user-associated program instance is passed by the party that carries out the qualification step to the user or to a third-party, the program instance being digitally signed by the party that carries out the qualification step whereby to enable an eventual service deliverer to check the origin and authenticity of the user-associated program instance. Okamoto teaches that the token [i.e., user-associated program instance] is passed by the party that carries out the qualification step to the

Art Unit: 2645

user or to a third-party, the program instance being digitally signed by the party that carries out the qualification step whereby to enable an eventual service deliverer to check the origin and authenticity of the token (abstract; fig.7; page 4, paragraphs 0048, 0049, page 7, paragraph 0108, page 8, paragraphs 0134-0136, 0139, 0142). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Valentine in view of Tarbox to incorporate the user-associated program instance is passed by the party that carries out the qualification step to the user or to a third-party, the program instance being digitally signed by the party that carries out the qualification step whereby to enable an eventual service deliverer to check the origin and authenticity of the user-associated program instance as taught by Okamoto. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to perform secure transaction associated with a user.

10. Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Valentine et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,011,973) in view of Tarbox (U.S. Patent No. 5,705,798) further in view of Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 6,129,274).

Regarding claim 20, Valentine in view of Tarbox fails to teach “the service repository is incorporated in the mobile entity associated with the user”. Tarbox teaches that the transaction history storage area 86 [i.e., service repository] is incorporated in the personal digital shopping assistant 10 [i.e., mobile entity] associated with the user (abstract; fig.1, 2; col.7, lines 58-67, col.8, lines 1-14, 54-61, col.10, lines 19-26, col.11, lines 3-19). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Valentine in view of Tarbox to allow the service repository being incorporated in the mobile entity associated with

the user as taught by Tarbox. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to store a shopping transaction history data.

Regarding claim 21, Valentine teaches that the message [i.e., service] execution environment is incorporated in the mobile entity associated with the user (col.1, lines 54-67, col.2, lines 1-14, line 45- col.3, line 3).

11. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Valentine et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,011,973) in view of Tarbox (U.S. Patent No. 5,705,798) further in view of Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 6,129,274) further in view of Okamoto et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0128257).

Regarding claim 22 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 15. Furthermore, Valentine teaches that the service execution environment is separate from the mobile entity but can inter-communicate with the latter via a wireless infrastructure at least when the mobile entity is positioned to give rise to a location match (col.1, lines 54-67, col.2, lines 1-14, line 45- col.3, line 20).

12. Claims 28, 29 and 31-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Valentine et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,011,973) in view of Okamoto et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0128257).

Regarding claim 28 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Valentine teaches that the service authorization [i.e., service token] qualifying the user to benefit from the particular service, the service authorization being distinct from the location data and indicative of the qualified user's entitlement to benefit from the

particular service and an authorization [i.e., qualifying-party] indicator indicative of the party that authorizes the user (col.1, lines 54-67, col.2, lines 1-14, line 45- col.3, line 20).

However, Valentine does not specifically teach “a service token provided by a party” and “the service token including a service identifier identifying said particular service”. Okamoto teaches a service token provided by a supplier [i.e., party] and the service token including a service identifier identifying the particular service (abstract; page 7, paragraph 0108, page 8, paragraphs 0139, 0142). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Valentine to incorporate a service token provided by a party and the service token including a service identifier identifying the particular service as taught by Okamoto. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide unique identification during the purchase transactions.

Valentine does not specifically teach “a qualifying-party indicator indicative of the party that authorizes the user”. Okamoto teaches a TSS ID [i.e., qualifying-party indicator] indicative of the party that authorizes the user (abstract; fig.7; page 7, paragraph 0119, page 8, paragraphs 0139, 0142). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Valentine to incorporate qualifying-party indicator indicative of the party that authorizes the user as taught by Okamoto. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide unique identification of supplier during a particular transaction.

Valentine further teaches that the service authorization being stored in a mobile entity associated with the user (col.2, lines 45- 60).

Valentine further teaches that the service provider system uses authorization indicator to check that the service authorization originates from a party for which it is willing to provide

Art Unit: 2645

service delivery before initiating delivery (col.1, lines 54-67, col.2, lines 1-14, line 45- col.3, line 20). (Note; service authorization inherently originates from an operator [i.e., party])

Regarding claim 29, Valentine teaches that the service token includes communication address details of the service provider system (col.2, lines 45- 60).

Regarding claim 31, Valentine teaches that the service token includes both a service identifier and a user identifier, step (b) including a sub-step of the service provider system checking the identity of the user of the mobile entity against the user identity in the service token (col.1, lines 54-67, col.2, lines 1-14, line 45- col.3, line 20).

Regarding claim 32 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 28. Furthermore, Valentine fails to teach that the service token includes user identity data and is digitally-signed by the party that carried out the qualification in step (a) whereby the service provider system can check the authenticity of the data in the location information, the user mobile entity that passes the service token to the service provider system having an associated key pair, formed by a public-key and a private key, and being required by the service provider system to authenticate its identity by using its private key to sign and return data proposed by the service provider system. Okamoto teaches that the service token includes user identity data and is digitally-signed by the party that carried out the qualification in step (a) whereby the service provider system can check the authenticity of the data in the location information, the user mobile entity that passes the service token to the service provider system having an associated key pair, formed by a public-key and a private key, and being required by the service provider system to authenticate its identity by using its private key to sign and return data proposed by the service provider system (abstract; fig.7; page 4, paragraphs 0048, 0049,

Art Unit: 2645

page 7, paragraph 0108, page 8, paragraphs 0134-0136, 0139, 0142). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Valentine to incorporate the service token including user identity data and being digitally-signed by the party that carried out the qualification in step (a) whereby the service provider system can check the authenticity of the data in the location information, the user mobile entity that passes the service token to the service provider system having an associated key pair, formed by a public-key and a private key, and being required by the service provider system to authenticate its identity by using its private key to sign and return data proposed by the service provider system the user mobile entity that passes the service token to the service provider system as taught by Okamoto. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to perform secure token-based document transaction services.

Regarding claim 33 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 9.

Regarding claim 34, Valentine teaches that the service token is digitally-signed by the party that carries out the qualification in step (a) whereby the service provider system using this digital signing of the service token to check the origin and authenticity of the service token (col.1, lines 54-67, col.2, lines 1-14, line 45- col.3, line 20).

Regarding claim 35 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Valentine teaches the database 190 (i.e., location server) of a wireless (i.e., cellular telephone) communications infrastructure usable by the mobile entity (fig.1; col.3, lines 4-20).

Regarding claims 36-38 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 13, 14 and 17 simultaneously.

Regarding claims 39, 42 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 8.

Regarding claim 40 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 18 and 28. Furthermore, Valentine teaches that a service delivery subsystem for providing the particular service, the service delivery subsystem being separate from the mobile entity (fig.1; col.1, lines 54-67, col.2, lines 1-14, line 45- col.3, line 20).

Regarding claim 41 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 19.

13. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Valentine et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,011,973) in view of Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 6,129,274) further in view of Eldridge et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,601,102).

Regarding claim 7, Valentine teaches that the program (i.e., user-associated program instance) includes user identity data and is digitally-signed by the party that carried out the qualification step (a) whereby the service provider system can check the authenticity of the data in the program (abstract; fig.3; page 4, lines 14-20, page 10, lines 6-14, 23, 24).

However, Valentine in view of Suzuki fails to teach “the user mobile entity having an associated key pair, formed by a public-key and a private key, and being required by the service provider system to authenticate its identity by using its private key to sign and return data proposed by the service provider system”. Eldridge teaches that the user mobile entity having an associated key pair, formed by a public-key and a private key, and being required by the server

Art Unit: 2645

(i.e., service provider system) to authenticate its identity by using its private key to sign and return data proposed by the server (fig.1, 2; col.4, lines 9-15, 42-67, col.5, lines 1-8, col.7, lines 5-29, 48-51, 56-67, col.8, lines 1-25). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Valentine in view of Suzuki to allow the user mobile entity having an associated key pair, formed by a public-key and a private key, and being required by the service provider system to authenticate its identity by using its private key to sign and return data proposed by the service provider system as taught by Eldridge. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to perform secure token-based document transaction services using key pair.

14. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Valentine et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,011,973) in view of Okamoto et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0128257) further in view of Norris (U.S. Patent No. 6,718,328).

Regarding claim 30, Valentine in view of Okamoto fails to teach “the service token includes a password for accessing the service provider system”. Norris teaches that the service token includes a password for accessing the server (i.e., service provider system) (col.5, lines 34-47). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Valentine in view of Okamoto to allow the service token including a password for accessing the service provider system as taught by Norris. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to perform secure media file transaction services using password based token.

***Conclusion***

15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Md S. Elahee whose telephone number is (571) 272-7536. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri from 8:30am to 5:00pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (571) 272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Art Unit: 2645

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*M.E.*

MD SHAFIUL ALAM ELAHEE  
August 21, 2005



FAN TSANG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600